

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. By amendment herewith, Applicants has amended independent Claims 12, 24, 41 and 42.

#### **Telephonic Interview**

Applicants wish to express their appreciation for the telephonic interview conducted on September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006, among Examiner Talbot, inventor Mark Hampden-Smith, Mr. Jaimes Sher and Mr. David Dockery. This interview was summarized in the Interview Summary mailed by the U.S. Patent Office on September 15, 2006.

During the telephonic interview, the applied references were discussed, particularly U.S. Patent No. 6,416,174 by Ito et al. (hereinafter "Ito et al."). Applicants pointed out that Ito et al. is generally directed to the deposition of pigments to form a colored layer, such as for a color filter in a display device, although Ito et al. does list some phosphor materials as inorganic pigments for use in such a layer. (Col. 7, lines 40-47)

It was further pointed out that Ito et al. does not disclose any resolution of the issues that are inherent when attempting to deposit phosphor particles from low viscosity dispersions (such as by using an ink-jet device), as compared to the deposition of pigments by such methods. Phosphor materials are generally more dense than pigment materials, and settling of the phosphor particles is a major impediment to the successful deposition of phosphor materials from a low viscosity dispersion of the particles. The present inventors have found that several key morphological properties significantly enhance the ability to deposit the particles from a low viscosity dispersion, including a spherical morphology, a narrow size distribution or a low apparent density. The importance of these characteristics is not recognized by Ito et al. or the other references of record.

The Examiner suggested that the claims should include some language to differentiate the present invention from the deposition of a colored layer, such as for a color filter.

Applicants forwarded the claim amendments submitted herein on September 15, 2006, for the Examiner's consideration. In a further brief telephone conference on September 25, 2006, between Examiner Talbot and Mr. Dockery, the Examiner indicated

that he would enter and consider the foregoing amendments in view of the telephonic interview referenced above.

### **Amendments**

Applicants have amended independent Claims 12 and 41 to indicate that the phosphor pattern *comprises phosphor particles* to better differentiate the present method for depositing a phosphor layer from a method for depositing a colored layer comprising pigments.

Independent Claims 24 and 42 have been amended to recite that the phosphor particles are deposited in predetermined pixel regions *to form pixels*, thereby more clearly differentiating the present method from the deposition of a colored layer that comprises pigments.

In summary, Claims 12-19, 24-27 and 29-42 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,100,633 by Okumura et al., in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,921,836 by Nanto et al., further in combination with Ito et al. Both Nanto et al. and Okumura employ a paste (high viscosity) for deposition of phosphor particles. Ito et al. is directed to ink-jet deposition of materials for the colored filter layer of a display. Ito et al. does not recognize, nor do any other prior art references recognize, the advantages of utilizing phosphor particles that are spherical (independent Claims 12, 24, 41 and 42), particles that have a low apparent density (Claim 17), such as hollow phosphor particles (Claim 18), or particles that have a narrow size distribution (dependent Claims 25, 26, 37 and 38) for providing improved ink-jet deposition of the phosphor materials.

In view of these amendments and the discussions with the Examiner, Applicants request reconsideration of the application and removal of this rejection.

Applicants do not believe that any fees in addition to the two-month extension of time are due with regard to this Response. However, if any such fees are due, please debit those fees from Deposit Account No. 50-1419.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecute and or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: /David Dockery Reg 34323/  
David F. Dockery  
Registration No. 34,323  
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411  
Aurora, Colorado 80014  
(303) 338-0997

Date: September 25, 2006